

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

ARIZONA.

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

RECEIVED

JAN 16 3 24 PN 198

DOMESTICS TOURS

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN
RENZ D. JENNINGS
COMMISSIONER
CARL J. KUNASEK
COMMISSIONER

IN THE PROVISION OF ELECTRIC

SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF!

Kenneth C. Sundlof Jr.

Jennings, Strouss and Salmon, P.L.C.
Two North Central Avenue

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Telephone: (602) 262-5946

Facsimile: (602) 253-0061

Jane D. Alfano Corporate Counsel

Salt River Project PAB 300

P.O. Box 52025 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2025

Telephone: (602) 236-3349 Facsimile: (602) 236-5397

Attorneys for: Salt River Project

DOCKETED

JAN 1166 19998

DOORNETLED BAA

JH

IN THE MATTTER OF THE COMPETITION) DOCKET NO. U-0000-94-165

SRP'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS REQUEST FOR A NEW PROCEDURAL ORDER

Reply to the Response of APS

SRP and its customers have consistently advocated that the Competition Rules remain intact, and that the start of competition not be delayed. As the implementation of competition requires coordination of efforts statewide, SRP has participated in the public debates which were part of the Commission's rule-making process. But, when the proceedings turn to the specific issues of stranded cost numbers and recovery mechanisms, SRP must move into its own public process. This is because SRP has its own independent responsibilities and authorities which it

cannot delegate to a Commission adjudicatory process. This is also because SRP should not become involved, and does not want to become involved, in a quasi-judicial case which will determine actual stranded cost numbers of other utilities. It is for these reasons that it is "appropriate" for SRP to take the position that rule-making activities should be conducted in a rule-making forum¹.

The issue is not that SRP wants to avoid discovery and cross examination. Rather, the point is that SRP must conduct its own processes and make its own determinations. While SRP as a governmental body may be subject to certain public records laws and disclosure requirements, it is the SRP board which is responsible for maintaining distribution of records and information. SRP cannot delegate this responsibility to the Commission through a discovery process. SRP must detour to its own proceedings at the point at which the Commission turns from general policy to evidentiary hearings.

SRP has never argued that the procedural orders are unlawful. SRP readily acknowledges that the Commission has wide latitude in choosing the methods for rule-making. It is rather SRP's suggestion that the process would be more meaningful, and would permit fuller participation, if the quasi-legislative format is continued.²

¹ We cannot resist a preliminary comment on the hypocrisy of the APS response. APS has sued the Commission claiming that the Competition Rules are unconstitutional. Waiting for a constitutional amendment could result in substantial delay. And, while the parties are debating the proper treatment of stranded costs, APS has negotiated a rate order that is already allowing APS to recover a portion of its stranded costs in current rates. (In its 1996 rate order APS received an order allowing it to recover over eight years a portion of its stranded costs called the regulatory assets. See the APS pre-filed testimony, filed on January 9, 1998 in this docket, testimony of Jack Davis, page 12, lines 14 through 19.) Now, in this response, APS urges that SRP should remain a party to "help insure that meaningful retail access is provided to the thousands of SRP customers". Yet, in the same document, APS reserves its right to *again* sue the Commission, and further delay the implementation of competition. Specifically in footnote 2, on page 3, APS states:

The proposed limits on cross-examination and the somewhat amorphous scope of these proceedings raise potential due process concerns. However, APS believes it would be premature to raise such issues unless and until an actual controversy develops.

The Commission should consider APS's comments in appropriate perspective.

² It is easy for APS to argue for an evidentiary hearing. It has been in this game for years. It has been nice to see the active participation in the rule-making process of many new interests, many participating, as needed, without lawyers. An open process, not requiring lawyers and evidentiary rules, encourages full participation. The

APS appears to argue that SRP is already an involuntary party to the adjudicatory proceeding, and should be forced to participate. APS states no basis upon which the Commission would have jurisdiction to force SRP to participate in adjudicatory stranded costs proceedings³. The Constitution expressly recognizes that there is no need for the Commission to impose a second level of public review over a public power entity which is already answerable to its voters.

Reply to the Response of Staff

As mentioned above, SRP is not arguing that the procedural orders are illegal. SRP simply argues that a quasi-legislative format is more accepted for rule making. SRP points to the provisions of the APA, which recognize this distinction, and to the Staff's own argument, that an evidentiary proceeding would be inappropriate for rule making.

Staff argues that participation is not limited under the new format, because the order was sent to all parties and the participants in the stranded cost workshops were automatically designated as parties. But, the volumes of material produced in the workshops have been specifically excluded by the hearing officer. This phase of the docket will be decided on evidence produced at these evidentiary hearings.

Staff also argues that a party may participate through public comment. But, public comment is limited to a five minute presentation at the beginning of the hearings. This hardly gives a participant the opportunity to provide meaningful input on these complex issues.

SRP is convinced that the Staff's intentions are good, and that the procedural order does encourage broad participation. But the realities in a major evidentiary case is that the public comments, briefly made at the beginning of the case, have little or no impact on the final result. Only those parties who can afford experienced counsel, expert witness and consultants, who

legislature does not conduct adversarial hearings, yet it manages to enact laws having much greater impact than those being considered in this docket.

³ APS argued that SRP submits itself to Commission jurisdiction in certain line siting and financing matters. While SRP is subject to these ministerial review processes, this limited involvement by the Commission in no sense constitutes regulation in the same sense that it regulates public service corporations, which would be a violation of Article 15, Section 2 of the Constitution.

participate actively in the proceedings (translate to "expensive") truly have an effective voice and opportunity to influence the final result.

SRP is serious about its continued statements and actions to bring competition to the Arizona electric industry. It makes these suggestions in a true constructive spirit to further the statewide debates in the forum of Commission rule making. If the Commission wants to move the game to the home court of the regulated utilities, this is its choice.

SRP respectfully requests that the Commission grant its request and change the procedural orders issued in this docket.

DATED this 16th day of January, 1998

JENNINGS STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C.

By

Kenneth C. Sundlof, Jr.

SALT RIVER PROJECT AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DISTRICT

By Jane D. Alfano

COPY of the foregoing mailed this 16th day of January, 1998 to:

Barbara Klemstine ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO. Law Department, Station 9909 P.O. Box 53999 Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999

Greg Patterson RUCO 2828 N. Central Ave., Suite 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael A. Curtis
MARTINEZ & CURTIS, P.C.
2712 North 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006
Attorneys for Arizona Municipal
Power Users' Association

Walter W. Meek, President ARIZONA UTILITY INVESTORS ASSOC. 2100 N. Central Ave., Suite 210 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Rick Gilliam LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200 Boulder, CO 80302

Charles R. Huggins ARIZONA STATE AFL-CIO 110 North 5th Avenue P.O. Box 13488 Phoenix, AZ 85002

David C. Kennedy LAW OFFICES OF DAVID C. KENNEDY 100 West Clarendon Ave., Suite 200 Phoenix, AZ 85012-3525

Norman J. Furuta
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
900 Commodore Drive, Building 107
P.O. Box 272 (Attn Code 90C)
San Bruno, CA 94066-0720

Thomas C. Horne Michael S. Dulberg HORNE, KAPLAN & BISTROW, P.C. 40 N. Central Ave., Suite 2800 Phoenix, AZ 85004 Barbara S. Bush COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE ENERGY EDUCATION 315 West Riviera Drive Tempe. AZ 85252

Sam Defraw (Attn. Code 16R)
Rate Intervention Division
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
200 Stovall Street, Room 10S12
Alexandria, VA 22332-2300

Rick Lavis ARIZONA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION 4139 East Broadway Road Phoenix, AZ 85040

Steve Brittle
DON'T WASTE ARIZONA, INC.
6205 South 12th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040

Karen Glennon 19037 N. 44th Avenue Glendale, AZ 85308

AJO IMPROVEMENT COMPANY P.O. Drawer 9
Ajo, AZ 85321

COLUMBUS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. P.O. Box 631 Deming, NW 88031

CONTINENTAL DIVIDE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 1087 Grants, NM 87020

DIXIE ESCALANTE RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOC. CR Box 95
Beryl, UT 84714

GARKANE POWER ASSOCIATION, INC. P.O. Box 790 Richfield, UT 84701

MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. P.O. Box 1045
Bullhead City, AZ 86430

MORENCI WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY P.O. Box 68
Morenci, AZ 85540

Stephen Ahern ARIZONA DEPT. OF COMMERCE ENERGY OFFICE 3800 N. Central Ave., 12th Floor Phoenix, AZ 85012

Betty Pruitt
ARIZONA COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOC.
67 E. Weldon, Suite 310
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Choi Lee PHELPS DODGE CORP. 2600 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004-3014

Bradley Carroll TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER CO. P.O. Box 711 Tucson, AZ 85702

Creden Huber SULPHUR SPRINGS VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 820 Willcox, AZ 85644

Mick McElrath CYPRUS CLIMAX METALS CO. P.O. Box 22015 Tempe, AZ 85285-2015

Wallace Kolberg SOUTHWEST GAS CORP. P.O. Box 98510 Las Vegas, NV 89193-8510

A. B. Baardson NORDIC POWER 4281 N. Summerset Tucson, AZ 85715

Michael Rowley c/o CALPINE POWER SERVICES 50 West San Fernando, Suite 550 San Jose, CA 95113

Dan Neidlinger 3020 N. 17th Drive Phoenix, AZ 85015 Jessica Youle
PAB 300
SALT RIVER PROJECT
P.O. Box 52025
Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025

Patricia Cooper AEPCO P.O. Box 670 Benson, AZ 85602-0670

Clifford Cauthen
GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC CO-OP
P.O. Drawer B
Pima, AZ 85543

Marv Athey TRICO ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 35970 Tucson, AZ 85740

Joe Eichelberger MAGMA COPPER COMPANY P.O. Box 37 Superior, AZ 85273

Wayne Retzlaff NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC CO-OP INC. P.O. Box 308 Lakeside, AZ 85929

Beth Ann Burns CITIZENS UTILITY COMPANY 2901 N. Central Ave., Suite 1660 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Steve Kean
ENRON
P.O. Box 1188
Houston, TX 77251-1188

Jack Shilling DUNCAN VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 440 Duncan, AZ 85534

Nancy Russell
ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF INDUSTRIES
2025 N. 3rd Street, Suite 175
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Barry Huddleston DESTEC ENERGY P.O. Box 4411 Houston, TX 77210-4411

Steve Montgomery JOHNSON CONTROLS 2032 West 4th Street Tempe, AZ 85281

Terry Ross CENTER FOR ENERGY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 7853 E. Arapahoe Court, Suite 2600 Englewood, CO 80112

George Allen ARIZONA RETAILERS ASSOC. 137 University Mesa, AZ 85201

Ken Saline K. R. SALINE & ASSOCIATES P.O. Box 30279 Mesa, AZ 85275

Louis A. Stahl STREICH LANG 2 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004

Douglas Mitchell SAND DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC CO. P.O. Box 1831 San Diego, CA 92112

Sheryl Johnson TEXAS-NEW MEXICO POWER CO. 4100 International Plaza Forth Worth, TX 76109

Ellen Corkhill AARP 5606 North 17th Street Phoenix, AZ 85016

Phyllis Rowe ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL 6841 N. 15th Place Phoenix, AZ 85014 Andrew Gregorich BHP COPPER P.O. Box M San Manuel, AZ 85631

Larry McGraw USDA-RUS 6266 Weeping Willow Rio Rancho, NM 87124

Jim Driscoll ARIZONA CITIZEN ACTION 2430 S. Mill, Suite 237 Tempe, AZ 85282

William Baker ELECTRICAL DISTRICT NO. 6 P.O. Box 16450 Phoenix, AZ 85011

John Jay List General Counsel NATIONAL RURAL UTILITIES COOPERATIVE FINANCE CORP. 2201 Cooperative Way Herndon, VA 21071

Wallace Tillman Chief Counsel NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION 4301 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22203-1860

Robert Julian PPG 1500 Merrell Lane Belgrade, MT 59714

C. Webb Crockett
FENNEMORE CRAIG
Two N. Central Ave., Suite 2200
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2390

Department of Navy Naval Facilities Engineering Command Navy Rate Intervention Attn: Sam DeFrawi 901 M Street SE, Building 212 Washington, DC 20374 Robert S. Lynch 340 E. Palm Lane, Suite 140 Phoenix, AZ 85004-4529

Douglas A. Oglesby VANTUS ENERGY CORPORATION 353 Sacramento Street, Suite 1900 San Francisco, CA 94111

Robert Franciosi GOLDWATER INSTITUTE Bank One Center 201 North Central Concourse Level Phoenix, AZ 85004

Stan Barnes
COPPER STATE CONSULTING GROUP
100 W. Washington St., Suite 1415
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Carl Robert Aron
Executive Vice President and CEO
ITRON, INC.
2818 N. Sullivan Road
Spokane, WA 99216

John Branch CITY OF MESA ELECTRIC UTILITY P.O. Box 1466 Mesa, AZ 85211-1466

Vincent Hunt CITY OF TUCSON, DEPT. OF OPERATIONS 4004 S. Park Ave., Bldg. 2 Tucson, AZ 85714-0000

Paul Bullis, Chief Counsel Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Carl Dabelstein
Director Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Barry, Hetzer, Stickley & Schutzman Court Reporters 2627 N. Third St., Suite 3 Phoenix, AZ 85004-1103

Douglas C. Nelson 7000 North 16th Street Suite 120-3097 Phoenix, Arizona 85020

Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr. MUNGER CHADWICK, P.L.C. 33 North Wilmot, Suite 300 Tucson, Arizona 85701

By Michele Orono